

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims has been cancelled 1, 9, 20, 26, 34, 41, 50, and 56. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims is moot.

Claims

2,3,4,6,7,8,10,12,13,16,17,21,22,24,27,29,30,32,33,35,36,37,39,40,42,43,44,47,51,52,54,55,57, and 58 are currently being amended. Traversal of the rejection of these claims and claims dependent thereon is respectfully made in view of the following arguments.

Selected dependent claims have been amended to place them in independent form for purposes of appeal. The dependencies of claims that depended from now-cancelled claims have been changed to the newly independent claims made in this response to thereby avoid section 112 problems. Because this amendment merely places selected dependent claims in independent form, no new issues are being raised.

This amendment adds, changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

The claims were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, because the examiner states that the specification for the application does not appear to support the negative limitation of getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination “that is not predetermined by a current site.” This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The examiner states that “Although the specification describes a reference to a destination that is based on user information in a user profile accessed via a user profile store in paragraphs 0138 on page 50, it does not explicitly teach that a reference to a destination needs to be not predetermined by a current site.” However, the language that the examiner refers to regarding the destination not being predetermined by a current site is inherent in the fact that the claim language and the specification require that the destination come from a

profile in a profile store network service. The profile store is, by definition, independent of the current site. Thus, the limitation is there in the language referenced by the examiner.

From a procedural standpoint, no prima facie case has been made for the rejection. The MPEP at 2173.05(i) expressly approves negative limitations. The MPEP points to the cases *Ex parte Parks*, 30 USPQ 2d 1234, 1236 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) and *In re Johnson*, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977) on the issue of basis in the specification for the negative limitation. In *Johnson* alternative elements were positively recited in the specification. The court stated that the “specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining.” In the present case, the language requiring that the destination come from a user profile accessed via a profile store network service provides the clear basis for this limitation.

Various claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) under Himmel or under 35 U.S.C. 103 under Himmel et al. in view of Rosen. These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration thereof is requested.

The invention as claimed with the steps of “getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination that is not predetermined by a current site and is based on user information in a user profile accessed via a user profile store; and causing the browser to browse to that destination, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference” is a programming interface that causes a browser to go to a network service (the profile store is an external network service, by definition), access a profile of the user and obtain a destination reference. This operation thereby provides the network effects of allowing any external web site, for example, to determine what printers or other preferred sites are associated with the user and are to be accessed simply via access to a user identity provided by an external service available on the network.

Himmel describes an external system wherein a user can save in the external system a large number of bookmarks, and can then access a selected set from this large number by inputting a key word. The key word search at the system will result in a set of bookmarks that can be downloaded to a client browser as a unit. In operation of Himmel, when a search query is received from a client, the query is searched for key words, and a bookmark set is obtained and downloaded based on any key words found in the query. Himmel does not teach

a destination that “is based on user information in a user profile accessed via a user profile store, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference,” i.e., Himmel does not teach an external network service (the profile store) that represents the user and is accessible by other independent devices on the network, and when accessed, provides a profile of the user that includes a destination reference.

The examiner refers to column 6, line 55- column 7, line 5 and column 8, lines 49-65. However, these cites discuss a “client identifier” that includes the “client’s machine address, credentials such as authentication and account information.” The examiner is reading this “client identifier” as the profile. The examiner points out that the downloading of the set of bookmarks only occurs if the user’s account has been paid, which information is reflected in the client identifier. The examiner is reading the overall bookmark storage system as the profile store. However, the bookmark storing system is not a profile store, i.e., an externally accessible site accessible by third party web sites that provides profiles on request. There is no disclosure that these client identifiers are accessible by third party web sites. Rather, the bookmark system is designed to download sets of bookmarks on demand. See column 6, lines 55-57. Importantly, there is no disclosure of a destination reference in the client identifier(see column 6, line 65- column 7, line 5), as required by the claim. Thus, even assuming that the bookmarks are considered destination references, they are not in a profile store that is accessed from the network (implicitly a programming interface), as required by the definition of profile store, and are not found in the profiles, as required by the claim.

Rossen discloses a remote printer control wherein remotely generated print jobs are stored at a printer and activated from a workstation via a browser interface. The Rossen configuration allows a user to browse to the printer web site and initiate printing at will. There is no “getting a direct or indirect reference to a destination that is not predetermined by a current site and is based on user information in a user profile accessed via a user profile store, wherein the step of getting a reference comprises accessing a user profile to obtain the destination reference.” In Rossen as with any other normal web site operation, one browses to the web site, and the web page has links that are predetermined, such as a button to print at the printer associated with that web site.

Note that “user profile store” is defined in the specification as a network service in paragraphs 49 and 89. In an example scenario in accordance with this claim language, the

user would browse to the web site "MAPQUEST," and after obtaining a desired map, would click the print button on the site web page. In a normal system, the desired map would be printed at the user's printer associated with his computer. In the Rossen system, the map would be stored at the Rossen printer and then printed at the Rossen printer. In contrast, in accordance with the claim language, the printer destination is not predetermined by a current web page, as in Rossen. And is not a default as set out by the user's computer. Rather, the destination reference is obtained via a programming interface accessing an external profile store network service to obtain a user profile. In other words, there is a network service that represents the user and is accessible by other devices on the network to thereby create network effects.

Claim 57 has also been rewritten in independent form. Neither Himmel or Rosen disclose preset printer settings associated with identification information from the user profile, which has been accessed from a profile store network service. Files that can be printed without further action by the operator has no relation to printer settings associated with identification information.

The various dependent claims set forth additional limitations which make each such claim allowable also for these additional limitations.

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

1/24/05

By



William T. Ellis
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,874